## REMARKS

The examiner has rejected claims 1-2, 4 and 15-16 as anticipated by Takemoto et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,004,208.

Takemoto et al. shows a slot machine that can superimpose on a display screen images from different storage locations. Game stop switches 109 are disclosed in Fig. 1, while a separate start lever 108 is also provided, as stated at column 5, lines 48-58 of Takemoto et al.:

Start lever 108 " ... is instruction means for accepting instruction to start symbol rotation display in the slot machine."

Game stop switches 109 "... which are provided in one-to-one correspondence with the columns, are instruction means for accepting game stop instructions. When a game stop instruction is accepted from the game stop switches 109, changing of the symbols is stopped at predetermined stop timings."

The "symbol rotation display" is shown by reference numeral 110, comprising a display that imitates the rotating wheels of a slot machine. See Takemoto et al. column 5, line 11 *et seq.*

Referring first to independent claim 1, a method of playing a game is provided involving a payline display with display segments and a player spin/stop button. Contrary to Takemoto et al., a first pressing of the player spin/stop button, after it has been enabled for the first time, starts a spin, followed by the stopping of some but not all of the display segments.

Thus, in the invention of claim 1, a first actuation of the enabled spin/stop button serves to cause spinning, not to stop spinning, and then some but not all of the display segments stop spinning spontaneously.

Following this, the same player spin/stop button, is enabled and pressed for a second time, with the effect that at least some of the remaining, spinning display segments stop spinning. Thus, a portion, but not all, of the spinning segments can have their spin terminated at the timing chosen by the game player. Furthermore, it is clear and inevitable from the language of claim 1 that the same spin/stop button causes at least some of the display segments to spin, and then the second push causes some but not all of the segments to stop spinning, since some but not all of the display segments have previously stopped spinning spontaneously.

Thus, it can be seen that the player spin/stop button described in claim 1 exerts control on multiple display segments, and not just one display segment as in Takemoto et al.

An illustration of this, look again at column 5, lines 50-53 of Takemoto et al., where one can read: "Game stop switches 109 which are provided in one-to-one correspondence with the columns are instruction means for accepting game stop instructions." (emphasis added)

In this section of Takemoto et al., it is clearly stated that the game stop switches 109 control only a single display segment, not multiple display segments as called for in claim 1 of this application. Furthermore, in Takemoto et al., there is no spin/stop button. There is a spin button, namely start lever 108, and there are stop switches 109, each stop switch being associated with and controlling a single display section 110.

Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 1 and its dependent claims find clear, patentable distinction over the disclosure of Takemoto et al.

The advantage of the invention as described in claim 1 can be achieved for example at a table where multiple players are sitting. In this invention, each player will have a single spin/stop button that controls multiple display segments. If the Takemoto et al. invention were present in the table of Fig. 2 of this application, there would have to be four stop buttons and a spin button for each player, there being seven players. That's 28 stop buttons and 7 spin buttons, rather than the simple arrangement of 7 spin/stop buttons used in this invention!

Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 1 is not anticipated by Takemoto et al. Furthermore, it is submitted to be clear that it is not obvious in view of Takemoto et al.

Claims 2-7 are all dependent upon claim 1, and thus share in its distinguishing features.

Claims 1 and 3 have been amended for purposes of editorial clarification and not to change the scope of the claims.

Turning to independent claim 15, similar distinctions over Takemoto et al. are found here. As indicated beginning on the seventh line of claim 15, when the spin-stop button is depressed after the first enabling, the effect is to cause display segments to spin, not to stop them from spinning. Then, some but not all of the display segments stop spinning of their own accord. Following this, when the first spin/stop button is enabled for the second time, and pushed, it causes "...at least some of the other display segments to stop spinning."

Here also, contrary to Takemoto et al., a single spin/stop button serves as a control for multiple spinning segments, starting a plurality of such segments to spin,

and, upon a second pressing of the spin/stop button causing some but not all of the display segments which started spinning to stop spinning.

This multiple, selective control of display segments from one button is simply not found in Takemoto et al. The clear teaching of that patent at column 5, line 51 is that each game stop switch 109 is provided "...in one-to-one correspondence with the columns...".

Thus, it is submitted that claim 15, and its dependent claim 14, is clearly patentably distinguishable over Takemoto et al.

The examiner has rejected claims 3, 5-7, and 13-14 as unpatentable over Takemoto et al. in view of Lowden U.S. Patent No. 5,630,586.

At the bottom of page 3 of the Office Action, the examiner states that Takemoto et al. teaches that game stop switch 109, when enabled and depressed causes at least some of the display segments to spin. See the language "...depressing the button (apparently referring to switch 109) to cause at least some of the display segments to spin...".

If that was what was intended by the examiner, it is not the case. The spinning begins by actuation of start lever 108. Each individual game stop switch then stops the individual spinning of one of the display sections 110.

As stated particularly on page 4 of the Office Action, the examiner states that Lowden discloses a method of playing a gaming machine at a table game apparatus where a player can bet on a dealer enabled, player selected spin at the game. The dealer enables the use of the spin button of each player on a sequential basis.

What is missing still from the combination of these references is the use of a single button to both start spinning by signal from the button as in claim 13 and the later stopping of some, while other of the plurality of display segments continue spinning. This is followed by a second enablement of the spin/stop button, depressing it for the second time to cause at least some of the other display segments to stop spinning, at the volition of the player.

Thus, the control of the one spin/stop button in claim 13 starts spinning of display segments first, and then subsequently actuation of the same button stops spinning of another group of display segments, which are a subset of the first group of display segments that were initially set to spinning by the same button.

It is submitted that nothing of this is taught in any combination of Takemoto et al. and Lowden. Lowden shows spin buttons 32f. These buttons start the spinning, and the stopping of spinning is spontaneous. Takemoto et al. shows game stop switches, but they only each control a separate display section 110. Nothing is shown of a single button that starts one group of display segments to spin, and then stops the spinning of a subset of those display segments, while other of the display segments stop their spinning automatically.

Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 13 and dependent claim 14 are clearly patentable over the cited prior art of the rejection. The amendments to each of these claims are made for editorial clarification, and are believed to be clearly supportable by the specification and other disclosure.

Turning to the examiner's argument at the second complete paragraph of page 5 of the Office Action, the examiner states: "Therefore the claimed invention does not

preclude a gaming system having a plurality of stop buttons each for stopping its respective reel".

Granted, but the next sentence is not correct, in that the examiner suggests that the combination of Takemoto and Lowden teaches the capability of a spin/stop button that can stop more than one reel. There is nothing in Takemoto et al. or Lowden, where any spin/stop button at all exists. They are either spin buttons or stop buttons. There is nothing in Takemoto et al. or Lowden which teaches a button that can both start reels spinning and then subsequently stop some of those reels. That is simply not present in the cited prior art, and that is what the claims of this application relate to.

In the last four lines of page 5, the examiner says: "The claimed language does not require the same button being depressed a second time where there are respective spin/stop button provided for each of a plurality of reels".

The examiner is urged to look at the language of claims 1, 13 and 15. In each case, the claim is talking about a single spin/stop button; the same one all the way through the claim. To be sure, some device with a multiplicity of spin/stop buttons could be covered by this claim. The device of Fig. 2 of this application is such a device that is covered by this claim. But the functioning of the individual spin/stop button as claimed herein is not found in the combination of prior art cited by the examiner.

In view of the above, allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
SEYFARTH SHAW

Garrettson Ellis
Registration No. 22,792
Attorney for Applicant

SEYFARTH SHAW
55 East Monroe Street, Suite 4200
Chicago, Illinois 60603
(312) 269-8567

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 2313-1450, on August 4, 2003.

Registered Attorney for Applicant
Date: August 4, 2003